

Dear Distinguished Members of the Joint Committee on Judiciary,

I oppose HB6816.

Microstamping:

- Enacting a requirement for “microstamping” is effectively a ban on all newly produced semiautomatic pistols within four years of passage.
- No firearm manufacturer currently produces a pistol that incorporates microstamping and with only two states, CA and NY requiring it, they most likely will not accommodate CT’s insistence they develop and incorporate microstamping.
- Blocking CT citizens access to firearms “in common use” violates the precedent established in *District of Columbia v Heller*.
- The notion the microstamping will produce a positive result in solving crimes is flawed. With no guns actually incorporating the technology, this will not result in solved crimes.

Raising the ammunition sales age.

- Raising the ammunition and magazine age is discriminatory. Current authorized 18–20 year-olds have already passed a background check.

Body armor:

- Restricting the purchase and possession of a purely defensive item while carving out exceptions for protected classes violates the equal protection clause of the 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment.
  - Will a child with a backpack having a ballistic panel not be afforded the same protection under the law as the DMV employee?
- Criminalizing all citizens currently in possession of body armor violates the takings clause of the 5<sup>th</sup> Amendment.
  - How would current legal owners be compensated for their banned items?

Thank you,  
Christopher Micklich  
Amston, CT